

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	iO. i	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/017,093		12/13/2001	Markus Klausner	11403/12	6511	
26646	7590	06/15/2004		EXAMINER		
	N & KENY	YON	NGUYEN, THU V			
ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			3661	3661	
				DATE MAILED: 06/15/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	Office Action Summary	10/017,093	KLAUSNER ET AL.				
	omoc Action Cammary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	The MAII INC DATE of this a mauricati a ann	Thu Nguyen	resp. adapse address				
The MAILING DATE of this c mmunicati n appears n the cover sheet with the c rresp ndence address - Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)[🔀]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Fe	ebruary 2004.					
'-		action is non-final.					
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
٠,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under E	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Dispositi	ion of Claims	•					
•		annlination					
•	Claim(s) <u>1-26 and 29-39</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
•	Claim(s) <u>20-26 and 29-39</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
·	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
,							
	on Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)[	10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 February 2004</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)[7	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
,	•	armior. Note the attached emec	7.00.01.01.10.11.7.7.0.7.02.				
•	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		4.0				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1 □ Contified conics of the priority decuments have been received.							
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> </ol>							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application 140.							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
		·					
Attachmen	t(s)						
_	te of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te				
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date	5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3661

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

The amendment filed on February 20, 2004 has been entered. By this amendment, claims 1-19 have been withdrawn from consideration, claims 27-28 have been canceled, claims 38-39 have been added and claims 1-39 are now pending in the application.

### Claim Objections

1. Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 32 improperly depends on the cancelled claim 27.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 20-26, 29-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bosch (US 6,493,629) in view of Hanson et al (US 2002/0156558) and further in view of Lang et al (US 6,295,492).

As per claim 20-21, 26, 33 Bosch teaches a system for monitoring at least one apparatus comprising: at least one sensor (col.2, lines 40-42; col.3, line 67; col.4, lines 1-2); a gateway

Application/Control Number: 10/017,093 Page 2

Art Unit: 3661

node 104 (fig.1) situated in the vehicle; and a processor 126, 130 (fig.1) for communicating with the gateway node 104 (fig.1) using wireless communication protocol (col.2, lines 52-62). Bosch does not explicitly teach a sensor for transmitting error code that concerns diagnostic information, and connecting a sensor to the controller via vehicle bus. However, Bosch teaches connecting the gateway node 104 (fig.1) to a vehicle bus 106 (fig.1). Moreover, Hanson teaches connecting sensors that send diagnostic information to the controller 130 (fig.2) via system bus 125 (fig.2) (para 0021), and Lang teaches that sensors can send codes indicating the status of components of a vehicle to a controller (col.5, lines 14-16, lines 38-40). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the sensors 120 (fig.2) of Hanson with the sensors of Lang and to connect the sensors to the system bus of Bosch in order to provide diagnostic information of the vehicle subsystems to the wireless device 130 (fig.2).

As per claim 22-25, 37, Hanson teaches using CAN bus protocol (para 0021). Further as to claim 23, Bosch teaches using Bluetooth communication protocol (col.2, lines 53-57). Moreover, interrogating an apparatus for diagnostic data when the user initiates a request to execute a diagnostic procedure, diagnosing a subsystem such as brake system, engine system would have been known.

Application/Control Number: 10/017,093

Art Unit: 3661

As per claim 29-31, 34-36, comparing the error code to a look up table to determines status code to be communicated to a user, and outputting the status code by visual display or audible signal would have been well known.

As per claim 32, since Bosch teaches a hand-held cellular phone or a laptop computer (col.2, lines 65-67), Bosch obviously teaches implementing a controller to the hand-held computer.

As per claim 38-39, since Bosch teaches a wireless communication including Bluetooth communication (col.2, line 56) Bosch obviously teaches the first bluetooth protocol implemented at node 126 (fig.1) and the second Bluetooth protocol implemented at mobile device 130 (fig.1). Further, as to claim 39, refer to claim 22 above.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 20, 2004 have been fully considered but they are 4. not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument on page 10, last paragraph, Hanson teaches connecting sensors to a CAN bus 125 (fig.1). Hanson's teaching proves that connecting sensors to a system bus would have been known as asserted by the examiner.

In response to applicant argument on page 11, third paragraph; page 12, first paragraph, on claim 20, Hanson teaches providing diagnostic information (para 0018; 0019; 0021), and

Application/Control Number: 10/017,093 Page 4

Art Unit: 3661

Lang teaches sensors transmitting status code (col.5, lines 14-16, lines 38-40). Further, since Bosch teaches Bluetooth wireless communication between the node 126 (fig.1) and the mobile device 130 (fig.1) (col.2, lines 56-57), and since it would have been known that for **B**luetooth communication to be performed, the node 126 and device 130 (fig.1) must each have corresponsing Bluetooth protocols so that the two device can communicate with each other. Although not use for the rejection, the examiner cited herein the teaching of Thayer et al (US 2002/0110146), in which Thayer teaches Bluetooth communication and first and second wireless protocols (para 0022; 0065-0067).

In response to applicant's argument on page 15, first paragraph, Bosch teaches a communication system that communicates information gathered from other devices such as crash sensor data, etc. to a mobile device 130 (fig.1) utilizing Bluetooth communication (col.2, lines 34-67). Bosch also teaches a communication data bus 106 (fig.1). On the other hand, Hanson teaches connecting sensors to a controller 130 (fig.2) via communication data bus 125 (fig.2), and Lang teaches that the data sent from the sensor is in status code format (col.5, lines 11-16), a person of ordinary skill in the art could be able to connect the sensors of Lang to the controller 104 (fig.1) of Bosch via bus 106 as suggested by Hanson to report working status of a vehicle system to a remote device.

#### Cited Prior Arts

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3661

Thayer et al (US 2002/0110146) teaches Bluetooth communication and the first and second wireless communication protocols being install to the device 30 (fig.1) and 40

(fig.1) (para 0026; 0030; 0050; 0065-0067).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

Application/Control Number: 10/017,093 Page 6

Art Unit: 3661

(703) 305-7687, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED

PROCEDURE")

Or:

(703) 305-7687 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park V, 2451 Crystal

Drive, Arlington. VA., Seventh Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thu Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-9130. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thomas Black, can be reached on (703) 305-8233. The fax phone number for this

Group is (703) 305-7687.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

THUV. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

May 21, 2004